

one of the distinct provisions of the bill or one distinct clause. If the hon. member does not like that particular clause, if he does not like the amendment which renders royalty payments non-deductible so far as federal income tax is concerned, he can attack that clause in committee. I submit to Your Honour, as the House leader has, that the hon. member's amendment does anticipate amendments to the bill which may be moved in committee and is concerned in detail with the provisions of the bill or with one particular provision found in one particular clause.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question for clarification? What is the nature of the amendment which could be moved in committee to carry out that which is anticipated by this motion? There is no way of putting such an amendment, I suggest to the minister, except by voting against the clause.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If it is difficult to move such an amendment at the committee stage, it may be even more difficult to move it at second reading stage. Therefore, that line of argument put forward by the hon. member may not advance that which he proposes.

I am concerned about the use of the time of the House for the remainder of the afternoon. The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), both of whom spoke in support of the amendment, introduced a note of convenience in bringing forth the precedents to which they referred. The precedents which they quoted refer to a principle adverse to the provisions of the bill, or adverse to the principles of the bill. Both hon. members, in arguing in support of the amendment, introduced the word "some" into that relevant sentence. I have not seen that word in my examination of the precedents. If it is there, I shall be glad to be told where it is.

These hon. members have taken the wording of the sentence to which they referred to mean that the principle ought to be adverse to some of the provisions of the bill. Having read those precedents, I have not seen that word. It certainly would be of interest if there is a precedent which says that a second reading amendment ought to be declaratory of a principle which is adverse to some of the provisions of the bill. If authority exists for such a proposition, I certainly should like to see it.

In the meantime, what I am concerned about is this: if the House proposes to resolve itself upon this matter some time this afternoon—which seems less and less likely—there will obviously be some pressure on the Chair to come to a conclusion quickly. On the other hand, if it is reasonably certain that the House will continue to discuss the matter today I could give the matter more careful consideration and perhaps come down with a decision tomorrow. May I conclude, unless there is an indication to the contrary, that there will be sufficient discussion of this matter to find the remaining 90 minutes?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No, only 30 minutes.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am glad you raised the point relating to "some principle adverse to" because that question disturbed some of us in

Income Tax

the midnight hours last night when we were looking for precedents.

Mr. Speaker: I want to make certain that the "some" is read in the right place. I am not talking about "some principle adverse to the provisions of the bill." I am talking about "a principle adverse to some of the provisions of the bill." There is quite a difference. If there is authority with respect to the last proposition, I should like to see it.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, you have been referred to May's eighteenth edition. I would refer you to the following words on page 527 of May's seventeenth edition: such amendment—

—may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill.

I think that wording covers the argument made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) on this point.

Mr. Speaker: I, of course, am troubled by the interpretation which has been made. That condition is met if the principle which is advanced in the second reading amendment is declaratory of a principle opposed to or different from some of the provisions of the bill but not all of them. I did not notice any authority for such statement. The hon. member has referred to some different wording, wording I should like to consider carefully before rendering judgment. I do not see why I will not be able to do this tomorrow, right after the question period when orders of the day are called.

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, the budget brought down by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) on November 18 was significant to all Canadians for a variety of different reasons. I would like to deal with the provisions of that budget as they affect resource industries and the impact they will have on future energy supplies for Canadians. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the impact which resource provisions will have in future has been drawn to the attention of the Canadian people, because the outcry from the people and from the press would have been even greater than it was with regard to proposed increases in the salaries of members of parliament.

The proposals of the Minister of Finance and the resulting retreat from energy self-sufficiency will cost Canada billions of dollars. Indeed, the economic viability of the country is at stake and we could, in time, face bankruptcy in the same way as Britain and Italy are now facing it. They are struggling on the brink. I am afraid that a lot of people in Canada think it could never happen here. I intend to outline the scenario for self-sufficiency and the projections into the 1980s, and speak about the possible condition of our economy in the 1980s.

I would like to deal with the items mentioned by the minister when he addressed the House on January 28. Early in his speech he referred to amendments relating to the taxation of the production income of the petroleum and mining industries as being a major source of controversy. The minister said there has been virtually no discussion whatever over what appears to be the core of the issue. He went on to say that it is simply a matter of